Application No. 10/659,224
Office Action Response Dated 3/27/2006
Reply to Office Action of December 27, 2005

## Remarks/Arguments

In the Office Action Mailed December 27, 2005, the Examiner rejected claims 1-6 and 11-16 under U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by EP Patent No. 45,015A to Doll. Additionally, the Examiner rejected claim 17 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over EP Patent No. 45,015A1 to Doll in view of EP Patent No. 1106049 A1 to Kemper. Finally, the Examiner objected to claims 7-10 and indicated that they would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

The Applicant has amended claim one to include the limitations of claims 2, 5 and 7. The Applicant believes that claim 1 as rewritten is now in condition for allowance. Additionally, since all remaining claims depend on claim 1, an allowable base claim, the Applicant believes that all remaining claims are also in condition for allowance.

In conclusion, the Applicant believes that the application is now in condition for allowance, and such allowance is respectfully requested.

Any fees or charges due as a result of filing of the present paper may be charged against Deposit Account 04-0525. Two duplicates of this page are enclosed.

Respectfully,

Attorney for Applicant(s)

Mark D. Weis Reg. No. 48,826 Patent Department Deere & Company One John Deere Place Moline, IL 61265

Telephone No. (309) 765-5867

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as first class mail in an envelope addressed to:

Commissioner for Patents

P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, VA 22313-145

Deere & Company

M. M. Slaus 3/27/06
Sprinture Date